

1
2
3
4
5 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
6 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

7 LAMARTICE WRIGHT,

8 *Petitioner,*

9 vs.

10 D.W. NEVEN, *et al.*,

11 *Respondents.*
12
13

Case No. 2:13-cv-01897-APG-PAL

O R D E R

14 This habeas matter under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 comes before the Court on petitioner's application
15 (Dkt. #1) to proceed *in forma pauperis* as well as for initial review of the papers presented pursuant to
16 Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.

17 The papers presented are subject to multiple defects.

18 First, petitioner has not properly commenced the action with a properly completed application
19 to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Petitioner did not attach the financial documents required for an inmate
20 to demonstrate pauper status. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2) and Local Rule LSR 1-2, petitioner must
21 attach both an inmate account statement for the past six months and a properly executed financial
22 certificate with the pauper application. Petitioner attached neither.

23 Second, petitioner did not use the Court's required petition form to state his claims. Under
24 Local Rule LSR 3-1, a petitioner must file the petition on the Court's required § 2254 petition form.
25 Here, petitioner used selected pages of the petition form essentially as a cover document for an
26 otherwise homemade petition form. Petitioner must use the required petition form for the entirety of
27 his federal petition.
28

1 Due to the multiple defects presented, the pauper application will be denied without prejudice
 2 and the present action will be dismissed without prejudice to the filing of a new petition in a new action
 3 with a pauper application with all required attachments. It does not appear that a dismissal without
 4 prejudice would result in a promptly-filed new action being untimely.¹

5 **IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED** that the application (Dkt. #1) to proceed *in forma pauperis*
 6 is **DENIED** without prejudice and that this action shall be **DISMISSED** without prejudice to the filing
 7 of a new petition in a new action with a properly completed pauper application with all required
 8 financial attachments.

9 **IT FURTHER IS ORDERED** that all pending motions are **DENIED** without prejudice.

10 **IT FURTHER IS ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**. Jurists of reason
 11 would not find the dismissal of this improperly-commenced action without prejudice to be debatable
 12 or wrong. The current dismissal will not materially impact the analysis of either the timeliness issue
 13 or other procedural issues in a promptly filed and properly commenced new action. *See* note 1, *supra*.

14 ///

15 ///

17
 18 ¹ The papers on file and the online docket records of the Nevada state courts reflect the following. *See, e.g.,*
 19 *Harris v. County of Orange*, 682 F.3d 1126, 1132-32 (9th Cir. 2012)(a federal court may take judicial notice of matters
 of public record, including documents on file in federal or state courts).

20 Petitioner Lamartice Wright seeks to challenge a Nevada state judgment of conviction, pursuant to a jury
 21 verdict, of conspiracy to commit robbery, robbery with the use of a deadly weapon, battery with a deadly weapon, and
 22 battery with intent to commit a crime. The Supreme Court of Nevada affirmed the conviction on direct appeal in No.
 58812 on June 13, 2012. The ninety-day time period for filing a petition for a writ of *certiorari* in the United States
 Supreme Court expired on September 11, 2012.

23 Approximately nine months later, on or about June 17, 2013, petitioner filed a state post-conviction petition.
 24 The state district court denied relief via a notice of entry of order filed on September 30, 2013. Petitioner's appeal from
 the denial of state post-conviction relief currently is pending before the Supreme Court of Nevada in No. 64117.


25 It thus appears that: (a) the federal limitation period will not begin to run again until after the end of the
 26 pending state post-conviction appeal; and (b) no claim of ineffective assistance of counsel included in the federal
 27 petition will be exhausted prior to the completion of the state post-conviction appeal, if then. *See also* Nev. R. App. Pro.
 4(b)(2)(any *arguendo* premature appeal treated as filed on the day of entry of judgment).

28 Petitioner at all times remains responsible for calculating the running of the federal limitation period as applied
 to his case and timely seeking state and federal relief.

1 The Clerk shall **SEND** petitioner two copies each of an application form to proceed *in forma*
2 *pauperis* for incarcerated persons and a noncapital § 2254 habeas petition form, one copy of the
3 instructions for each form, and a copy of all papers that he submitted.

4 The Clerk shall enter final judgment accordingly, dismissing this action without prejudice.

5 Dated this 23rd day of October, 2013.

6
7
8 

9 _____
10 ANDREW P. GORDON
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28